



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,270	01/26/2002	George E. Fox	010AUS	3019

26830 7590 06/09/2010
RICHARD COALE WILLSON JR
3205 HARVEST MOON DR
STE 200
PALM HARBOR, FL 34683-2127

EXAMINER

SIMS, JASON M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/057,270	Applicant(s) FOX ET AL.	
	Examiner JASON M. SIMS	Art Unit 1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 39-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 39-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments, filed 2/18/2010, have been fully considered. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Applicants have amended their claims, filed 9/8/2009, and therefore rejections newly made in the instant office action have been necessitated by amendment.

Claims 4-10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 28-29, and 39-47 are the current claims hereby under examination.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 9 does not appropriately end in a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 First Paragraph-Modified

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for performing the method wherein the defined grouping comprises a moiety selected from the group consisting of: a specific genus, species, serotype, and another grouping below the species level, but does not reasonably provide enablement for the moiety of a tribe. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to define a grouping on the tree of relationship based on a tribe, and practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988)) the CAFC considered the issue of enablement in molecular biology. The CAFC summarized eight factors to be considered in a determination of "undue experimentation". These factors include: (a) the quantity of experimentation necessary; (b) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (c) the presence or absence of working examples; (d) the nature of the invention; (e) the state of the prior art; (f) the relative skill of those in the art; (g) the predictability of the art; and (h) the breadth of the claims.

In considering the factors for the instant claims:

a) In order to practice the claimed invention one of skill in the art must make or perform the method of claim 4, specifically step D wherein one of the nodes includes tribe, i.e. a defined grouping on the tree of relationship comprises a moiety of tribe. For the reasons discussed below, undue experimentation would have been required to practice the claimed invention.

b) The specification provides guidance for making and using a defined grouping comprising a specific genus, species, or serotype, but does not provide guidance for defining a grouping based on tribe. In other words, the specification does not provide guidance as how to go about assigning probes or establishing genetic relationships within the tree based on "tribe."

Art Unit: 1631

c) The specification does not provide any working examples of how to establish or define genetic relationships within the tree based on tribe, such as what probes to assign.

e) State of the art is complicated and unpredictable.

f) The skill of those in the art of molecular biology is high.

g) The prior art is devoid of how to divide groups genetically within a phylogenetic tree based on tribe, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to establish such genetic relationships within the tree based on race. One of skill in the art would not know how to assign or create a database of signature probes or establish genetic relationships within the tree based on tribe.

The skilled practitioner would first turn to the instant specification for guidance to practice methods of how to establish genetic relationships within the tree based on tribe. However, the instant specification does not provide specific guidance to practice these embodiments. As such, the skilled practitioner would turn to the prior art for such guidance, however, the prior art is devoid of such teachings. Finally, said practitioner would turn to trial and error experimentation to determine how to create such a tree of relationship based on tribe. Such represents undue experimentation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 112 First paragraph, filed 2/18/2010 have been fully considered and are persuasive because of applicant's arguments and amendments. Therefore the rejection has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 112 First Paragraph filed 2/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the more narrowly define limitations in claim 9 comprising "subgroups; strain, tribe, and serotype" overcome the enablement rejection.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as defining a grouping for a "tribe" comprises the same challenge as that of race, wherein the enablement issue remains applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 Second Paragraph-Maintained/Modified

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 28-29, and 39-47 and all claims dependent therefrom are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 and all claims dependent therefrom comprise the wording "substantially all," which has been deemed as vague and indefinite. It is unclear as to what comprises the metes and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant. The term "substantially all" is vague and indefinite and is not defined by the claim. Furthermore, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite substantially all, and one of ordinary skills in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Clarification via clearer claim wording is required.

Claim 28 and all claims dependent therefrom comprises a step, which is unclear as to what information it provides from the "formula." In other words, the step comprises calculating a "signature quality function" using a formula, which comprises the presence of sequences in a particular group of organisms or viruses and their

Art Unit: 1631

presences in other organisms NOT belonging to that group of organisms or viruses, i.e. the sequences appear to belong to any and all groups. Therefore, it is unclear as to what comprises the "single formula" and what information is derived from it when a sequence that belongs in anything and everything is included. Clarification via clearer claim wording is required.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 2/18/2010, with respect to the rejection of claim 29 under 35 USC 112 Second Paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive because of applicant's arguments. Therefore the rejection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103-Maintained

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1631

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4-9, 19, 21, 24, and 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebersole et al. (US P/N 6,797,817).

The claims are directed to a method for determining the genetic affinity of organisms or viruses in a test sample containing a nucleic acid comprising the steps of:

A) Obtaining or creating a nucleic acid sequence database of the same target nucleic acid, from all organisms or viruses that will be incorporated into the determination;

B) Obtaining or developing a bifurcating node phylogenetic tree having multiple nodes that establishes the genetic affinity between substantially all the organisms or viruses included in the nucleic acid sequence databases;

C) Optionally computationally fragmenting each target nucleic acid sequence such fragmentation being performed in a programmed computer so as to create a subsequence database of nucleic acid subsequences of length N that occur in at least two sequences in the nucleic acid database, where N is at least seven;

D) Tabulating in a programmed computer the extent to which the presence of each particular nucleic acid sequence of length N is characteristic of each node in the bifurcating node phylogenetic tree of genetic relationship by examining the occurrence frequency of each subsequence in the target nucleic acid of the organisms and viruses encompassed by or not encompassed by each node in the tree; to create a database of characteristic signature sequences;

E) Deriving a plurality of signature probes from a signature-database of characteristic signature sequences that will be complementary to a portion of the target nucleic acid sequence of the organism or virus if the signature sequence is present;

F) Hybridizing the signature probes to the target nucleic acid obtained from the test sample under conditions where a detectable signal will be produced by signature probes that hybridize to the target nucleic acid of the organism or virus and detecting such signals;

G) Identifying the nodes in the bifurcating node phylogenetic tree of genetic relationship that are represented by the signature probes that produced detectable signal, in order to determine the genetic affinity of the organism or virus in the test sample.

With regards to limitations of claims 4, 40, 43, and 45: Ebersole et al. teach at Col. 9, lines 35-45 that a phylogenetic Tree of Life was obtained and used for extracting sequences that represented the major microorganism domains, Bacteria and Archeae, which could be used as signature sequences for obtaining signature probes for testing for the presence of dechlorinating bacteria. Ebersole et al. further teach at the abstract, Figs. 1 – 2, and col. 5, lines 27-34, that the 16s rRNA regions, i.e. the target nucleic acid, are analyzed from the samples and organisms wherein their profiles/sequence database have been created, which reads on steps A) – B). Step C) is an optional step, not necessarily performed in the instant method. However, Ebersole et al. at col. 5, lines 40-45 and col. 9, lines 11-19 and line 46 teach identifying consensus sequences, which are subsequences which occur most frequently in the 16S target

Art Unit: 1631

nucleic acid of the organisms from which a 16s DNA profile was created. Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 9, lines 54-56 examples of the consensus sequences wherein the sequences are of length 7 or more (see SEQ ID NO: 34), which reads on limitations of step C). Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 4, lines 55-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4, lines 40-45, col. 8, lines 1-19, col. 9, lines 11-19 and lines 54-56 using sequence analysis software in a computer to analyze the consensus sequence, wherein the consensus sequences were found in each dechlorinating organism, and that the use of particular sequences, i.e. signature regions/sequences, may be used to identify dechlorinators as well as for genetic sub-typing of species. In addition, Ebersole et al. at col. 5, lines 60-62 teach identifying diagnostic sequences, which are subsequences which occur in at least two other sequences in the 16S target nucleic acid of the organisms from which a 16s DNA profile was created. Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 4, examples of the diagnostic sequences wherein the sequences are of length 7 or more (see SEQ ID NO: 31 or 32), which reads on limitations of step C). Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 4, lines 55-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4, lines 40-45, col. 8, lines 1-19, col. 9, lines 11-19 and lines 54-56 using sequence analysis software in a computer to analyze the consensus sequence, wherein the consensus sequences were found in each dechlorinating organism, and that the use of particular sequences, i.e. signature regions/sequences, may be used to identify dechlorinators as well as for genetic sub-typing of species. Furthermore, Ebersole et al. teach at col. 9, lines 46-54 that signature regions of subsequence length N (7 or more) were analyzed and found to be characteristic of different organisms, which reads on limitations of step D) and claim 45. Ebersole et al.

Art Unit: 1631

teach at col. 4, lines 55-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4, that sequence profiles, from which signature probes are derived, may be used to identify and subtype bacteria with similar metabolic pathways. Therefore, a signature probe may be used to identify a dechlorinated bacteria and/or bacteria with similar metabolic pathways, such as subspecies of dechlorinates, which further reads on steps E) - G). Ebersole et al. at col. 5, lines 34-39, col. 6, lines 31-34, col. 6, lines 58-67, and col. 7, lines 1-9 teach using signature sequences for generating probes and defines the use of probes and hybridization as such that is consistent in the art, which produce detectable signals, which further reads on step E). Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 2, lines 51-65, the use of signature probes in hybridizing to identify sequences such that a signal is detectable, which further reads on step F). Ebersole et al. teach at col. 8, lines 38-40 that the sequences are useful for the identification of new dechlorinating bacteria, as well as for sub-typing strains of *Dehalococcoides ethenogenes*. Furthermore, Ebersole et al. teach at col. 9, lines 19-40 that sequences used for obtaining probes and closest or nearest organisms to these sequences were determined, which further reads on step G).

Ebersole et al. suggest, but do not explicitly teach tabulating the extent to which the presence of each particular subsequence of length N is characteristic of each node in the bifurcating phylogenetic tree of genetic relationship by examining the occurrence frequency of each subsequence in the target nucleic acid to create a database of characteristic signature sequences.

Art Unit: 1631

Ebersole et al. suggest this because they teach at col. 5, lines 40-45 and col. 9, lines 11-19 and lines 46-56 using software to analyze the consensus sequence, which are a set of bases which occur most often in the 16S sequences of the organisms and are characteristic of the group of dechlorinating organisms. Ebersole et al. further teach determining signature regions and sequences for identifying particular organisms, which are characteristic of those organisms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to have tabulated the extent to which the presence of each particular subsequence of length N is characteristic of each node in the bifurcating phylogenetic tree of genetic relationship by examining the occurrence frequency of each subsequence in the target nucleic acid to create a database of characteristic signature sequences in the method taught by Ebersole et al. This is because Ebersole et al. already considers how particular sequences are characteristic of individual and groups of organisms. One of skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique of tabulating the extent to which the sequences were characteristic of each node (i.e. group or individual organism) would have yield predictable results.

Ebersole et al. teach claims 5 and 41 -42 at col. 2, lines 50-59 wherein rDNA are used for obtaining probes, which reads on the use of DNA for comprising signature probes.

Ebersole et al. teach claim 6 at col. 6, lines 58-67 wherein hybridization is taught which is consistent in the art wherein a hybridization step is done in solution, which reads on claim 6.

Art Unit: 1631

Ebersole et al. teach claim 7 at col. 13, lines 25-30 wherein it is taught that probes which generate a detectable signal are used, which makes obvious a probe wherein the detection step utilizes radioactive labels, chemiluminescence, and/or fluorescence.

Ebersole et al. teach claim 9, of defining a grouping of a specific species, i.e. dechlorinating bacteria, see Col. 9, lines 35-45.

Ebersole et al. suggest, but do not explicitly teach wherein the tree comprises 11 or more nodes as in claim 39 and a limitation in claim 45.

Ebersole et al. suggest this because they teach at col. 1-2 a method of identifying several species of dechlorinating bacteria, which uses phylogenetic relationships. Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 2, lines 60-65 being able to identify new strains of dechlorinating bacteria.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to have used a tree comprising 11 or more nodes for use in the method of identifying bacteria as taught by Ebersole et al. This is because Ebersole et al. teach a method of using a tree of nodes for help in identifying dechlorinating bacteria. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that as new/ i.e. more dechlorinating bacteria are identified, see col. 2, lines 60-65, that any phylogenetic tree used in the identification process would also comprise more nodes. Therefore, the use of 11 or more nodes in a phylogenetic tree as opposed to fewer than 11 nodes, is a result of an optimized parameter and not the product of innovation. The differences

Art Unit: 1631

between the claimed invention and the prior art were encompassed in known variation or in a principal known in the prior art.

Ebersole et al. suggest, but do not explicitly teach where the same target nucleic acid sequence is obtained from at least 12 organisms or viruses as in claim 44 and a limitation of claim 45.

Ebersole et al. suggest this because they teach at col. 1-2 a method of identifying several species of dechlorinating bacteria, which uses phylogenetic relationships and several nucleic acid sequences. Ebersole et al. further teach at col. 2, lines 60-65 being able to identify new strains of dechlorinating bacteria.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to have used the same target nucleic acid sequence obtained from at least 12 organisms or viruses for use in the method of identifying bacteria as taught by Ebersole et al. This is because Ebersole et al. teach a method of using a tree of nodes for help in identifying dechlorinating bacteria. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that as new/ i.e. more dechlorinating bacteria are identified, see col. 2, lines 60-65, that more sequences would be used in the identification process. Therefore, the use of sequences from 12 or more organisms or viruses is a result of an optimized parameter and not the product of innovation. The differences between the claimed invention and the prior art were encompassed in known variation or in a principal known in the prior art.

Ebersole et al at col. 9 and col. 10, teach using consensus sequences for identifying signature regions, i.e. signature sequences, wherein the sequences

Art Unit: 1631

comprise at least 12 (see the 16s rDNA base substitutions of the consensus sequences, which when taken independently or together are usable for a diagnostic for dechlorinating bacteria), and the consensus sequences are at least 30% identical over at least one subsequence of at least 50 nucleotides (see SEQ ID NO: 34) as in claim 46.

Ebersole et al. teach at col. 9, lines 46-65 teach using consensus sequences of length 7 or longer that occur in all the dechlorinating isolates when creating a profile, i.e. database of signature sequences as in claim 47.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues at pages 15-17 of the remarks that Ebersole does not teach a method for analyzing what is in the sample, only whether or not a particular organism or type is present.

Applicant's argument is not found persuasive because Ebersole et al. teach at col. 8, lines 38-40 that the sequences are useful for the identification of new dechlorinating bacteria, as well as for sub-typing strains of Dehalococcoides ethenogenes, wherein the identification of new dechlorinating bacteria reads on analyzing what is in the sample and even if it has not been encountered previously, not just if an organism is present.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant argues that by seeking to determine the presence of a specific group of organisms whose identity is known ahead of time, Ebersole teach away from the present invention.

Applicant's argument is not found persuasive as Ebersole teach that "those 16S DNA gene sequences that were identified to be similar to the dechlorinating bacteria, *Dehalococcoides ethenogenes* DHE-195 (GenBank Accession No. AF004928), were aligned with selected 16s rRNA sequences extracted from the Ribosomal Database Project (Michigan State University) that were a representation of the major microorganism domains, Bacteria and Archeae in the Universal Phylogenetic Tree of Life. The sequences were aligned using MegAlign in DNASTar, using the default software parameters. From this alignment probable region for signature sequences were mapped. Furthermore, Ebersole teach the sequences are useful for the identification of new dechlorinating bacteria as well and therefore are not directed ONLY to specific or "known" bacteria. Further, the instant claims do not recite any limitations regarding whether the presence of an organisms is known (or not) prior to testing, therefore the argument that Ebersole teaches away from the claimed invention is moot.

Applicant further argues at page 17 that applicant uses sequences from ALL the groupings under consideration and not an exclusive set.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive because Ebersole uses the Tree of Life to determine the signature properties of oligonucleotides from a dechlorinating bacteria species, wherein that specific bacteria was of interest and thus uses

Art Unit: 1631

sequences from ALL the dechlorinating bacteria species that were the target and thus were all those “incorporated into the determination” as recited in steps A and B.

Applicant further argues that Ebersole fails to recognize that sequences associated with disparate groupings can contribute to an informative result.

Applicant’s arguments are not found persuasive as they are not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. The claimed invention does not recite this limitation that applicant argues.

Applicant further argues that Ebersole does not teach sequences which occur in at least two sequences in the database and as such the idea of “consensus sequences” does not meet this limitation.

Applicant’s arguments are not found persuasive as Ebersole teaches “diagnostic sequences” wherein subsequences within these sequences occur in at least two other sequences in the database as disclosed in SEQ Ids 31, 32, etc., which comprise sequences 1 and 34 in the sequence. Furthermore, as step C is an optional step in the instantly claimed method, it is not required to be taught by the prior art in order to meet the claimed limitations. In addition, although applicant exemplifies an example wherein a “consensus sequence” taught by Ebersole may not even occur, it is not the only result of building a consensus sequence in the invention taught by Ebersole. Ebersole takes into consideration frequency of occurrence, as evidenced by his creation of diagnostic sequences, which have subsequences of length 7 or more and occur in at least two other sequences in the database.

Applicant further argues at page 21 that Ebersole never creates subsequences to assist in the design process as is done in Applicant's invention.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as Ebersole examines signature regions, which are subsequences to assist in the design process as taught at col.s 8-10, see col. 10, lines 50-54.

Applicant further argues at page 21 that claim 4, step D recognizes that every subsequence of length N is potentially useful as a characteristic signature of each node in the bifurcating tree and must be considered. Applicant specifically argues that Ebersole teaches away from the present invention by implying that a sequence must be characteristic of one specific node to be useful.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as Applicant's invention is directed at only looking at those organisms or viruses that will be incorporated into the determination. Ebersole is incorporating only dechlorinating bacteria. Ebersole's invention can detect known bacteria and also unknown or new bacteria, which reads on the instant claims which do not necessitate organisms from different groups to be present but rather a method for determining the affinity of organisms that are present. Therefore, a method which identifies previously unknown dechlorinating bacteria, but determines they are indeed dechlorinating bacteria, inherently determines the genetic affinity of the detected organism. In addition, Ebersole looks at all the sequences in the 16s rRNS database for analysis, see Col. 9, lines 30-40 wherein subsequences which were characteristic of the node were examined, i.e. sequences 1 and 34.

Applicant further argues at page 22, that in the present invention, probes targeting multiple signature sequences are always used and multiple nodes are always targeted. Applicant further argues that in contrast, Ebersole uses multiple probes that target members of the same single target grouping.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as the limitation of using probes that always targets multiple probes and multiple signature sequences is not recited in the instantly claimed method.

Applicant further argues at page 23 that Ebersole does not examine subsequences, but instead looks at complete 16s rRNA sequences, wherein the use of alignment teaches away from the Applicant's method, which uses target sequences in unaligned form.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as Ebersole, although he performs alignments, at Cols 9-10 looks at sequence regions which are characteristic of the nodes being examined by the method taught by Ebersole. It is noted that the claims do not exclude use of aligned sequences.

Applicant further argues that Ebersole identifies signature sequence that is longer than length 7, but that this length is fortuitous and makes no consideration with regard to length when actually looking for potential signature sequences.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as the teaching of Ebersole of finding signature sequences longer than length 7 meet the limitation as recited in the instantly claimed method.

Applicant further argues that step D, they do the examination for every node in the tree, not just a single node as such in Ebersole's method.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as they are not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. The claimed invention does not necessarily look at every node in a tree, but rather a tree from those organisms or viruses that will be incorporated into the determination. Moreover, the tree is obtained or developed that establishes the genetic affinity between substantially all the organisms or viruses included in the database. Therefore, Ebersole only selecting a target of dechlorinating bacteria and determining genetic affinity between the nodes within this group reads on the recited limitations of the claimed method.

Again, applicant argues at pages 25-27 that Ebersole is focused on determining genetic identity rather than genetic affinity.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as Ebersole's invention can detect known bacteria and also unknown or new bacteria, which reads on the instant claims which do not necessitate organisms from different groups to be present but rather a method for determining the affinity of organisms that are present. Therefore, a method which identifies previously unknown dechlorinating bacteria, but determines they are indeed dechlorinating bacteria, inherently determines the genetic affinity of the detected organism. In addition, Ebersole looks at all the sequences in the 16s rRNS database for analysis, see Col. 9, lines 30-40 wherein subsequences which were characteristic of the node were examined, i.e. sequences 1 and 34.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant argues that the method taught by Ebersole overlook and never teach the potential value of subsequences of length N that lack such uniqueness, i.e. particular sequences that are characteristic of individual and groups of organisms and might instead be associated with multiple groupings. Applicant specifically argues that Ebersole focuses on those subsequences that are unique to his target group or specific organisms within the target group.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive because applicant's claimed invention is based on specificity as in step E. Claim 4, step E derives signature probes from signature sequences, which will only be complementary to the target nucleic acid of the organisms which comprise the signature sequence. Therefore, the target nucleic acid of the organisms must have the signature sequence present.

Applicant at page 28 argues that claims 5, 6, 7, 9, 41, and 42 are distinct for the reasons stated above.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive for the reasons stated above.

Applicant argues at page 29 that the instantly claimed invention does not use sequence alignment and thus is distinguishable over Ebersole.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as they do not preclude the use of a sequence alignment as set forth above.

Applicant further argues at page 29 that Ebersole does not teach the limitation of of part B in claim 10.

Applicant's arguments are found persuasive and claim 10 has been withdrawn from the instant rejection.

With regards to claims 39 and 45 Applicant argues at pages 30-31 that Ebersole is focused on determining genetic identify not affinity and that applicant's method does not use sequencing technology to determine genetic affinity and does not rely on direct comparison of aligned sequences.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive because Ebersole's invention can detect known bacteria and also unknown or new bacteria, which reads on the instant claims which do not necessitate organisms from different groups to be present but rather a method for determining the affinity of organisms that are present. Therefore, a method which identifies previously unknown dechlorinating bacteria, but determines they are indeed dechlorinating bacteria, inherently determines the genetic affinity of the detected organism. Furthermore, as stated above, using sequence alignment does not necessarily preclude the teachings of the instantly claimed limitations.

Applicant argues with respect to claim 45 that Ebersole is not calculating the % similarities among new isolates nor a matrix of the similarity between all pairs of isolates and because this information is central to tree construction is not utilizing a tree, but instead sequence alignment.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as Ebersole uses the phylogenetic tree of life, which was obtained to select those organisms of interest as taught at col. 9. The instantly claimed method requires obtaining or developing and thus using an obtained tree reads on the instantly claimed method limitations.

Applicant further argues with reference to claim 47 that consensus sequences are not used in the applicant's method, wherein a consensus sequence according to Ebersole may not even occur in any of the sequences from which the consensus was calculated.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive a list of sequences being used reads on a broad definition of a "database," which may be a table of consensus sequences or "diagnostic sequences" as taught by Ebersole.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebersole et al. (US P/N 6,797,817) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Coleman et al. (US P/N 6,738,502).

Ebersole et al. teach claim 4 as described above in the instant office action.

Ebersole et al. suggest do not explicitly teach generating the bifurcating phylogenetic tree of relationship by parsimony method.

Ebersole et al. suggest this because they teach using and creating a phylogenetic tree of organisms and in particular bacteria.

Coleman et al. teach at col. 2, lines 45-49 and col. 5, lines 50-57 a method directed to using 16S rRNA sequence information to deduce a phylogenetic relationship based on a parsimony method.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to have used a parsimony method for creating a phylogenetic

Art Unit: 1631

relationship as taught by Colman et al. for use in the method of using sequences and phylogenetic relationships for identifying bacteria as taught by Ebersole et al. Creating a phylogenetic tree by a parsimony method is a well known method as taught by Coleman et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have substituted one known element, i.e. deducing a phylogenetic tree based on parsimony for another method of deducing a phylogenetic tree, and the results of the substitution would have been predictable. The differences between the claimed invention and the prior art were encompassed in known variations or in a principal known in the prior art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that applicant's invention can simply use a tree from another source and therefore parsimony and other tree making methods are not essential.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive as the method of Ebersole could have used the tree method created by a parsimony method, which is well known and taught by Colman et al. as described above for identifying bacteria as taught by Ebersole and thus obviate claim 8.

Conclusion

No claim is allowable.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Sims, whose telephone number is (571)-272-7540.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached via telephone (571)-272-0720.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1631

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/ Jason Sims /

/Marjorie Moran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1631